

Homeland Security, for high crimes and misdemeanors.

Resolved, that Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas, Secretary of Homeland Security, is impeached for high crimes and misdemeanors and that the following Articles of Impeachment be exhibited to the United States Senate:

Articles of Impeachment exhibited by the House of Representatives of the United States of America in the name of itself and of the people of the United States of America against Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas, Secretary of Homeland Security, in maintenance and support of its impeachment against him for high crimes and misdemeanors.

Article I. Rather than adhering to an oath he took to defend and secure our country and uphold the Constitution when he was sworn in as Secretary of Homeland Security, Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas has engaged in a pattern of conduct that is incompatible with the laws of the United States as follows:

Article II of the Constitution requires that the executive branch, which today includes the Secretary of Homeland Security, ensures the laws passed by Congress and signed into law by the President are faithfully executed.

The Secure Fence Act of 2006, Public Law 109-367, requires that the Secretary of Homeland Security “maintain operational control over the entire international land and maritime borders of the United States.”

□ 1215

In his willful admittance of border crossers, terrorists, human traffickers, drugs, and other contraband, Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas has failed to maintain operational control of the border, thereby violating the Secure Fence Act of 2006.

The Guarantee Clause set forth in Article IV, Section 4 of the Constitution dictates, “The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against invasion; and on application of the legislature, or of the executive (when the legislature cannot be convened) against domestic violence.”

The Guarantee Clause clearly dictates that the Federal Government has a constitutional duty and obligation to protect each of the States from invasion. As Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, Alejandro Mayorkas has violated his oath to uphold this constitutional duty by allowing the invasion of approximately 10 million illegals across our borders. The ongoing invasion at our southern border is a direct national security threat against the States and against the citizens therein. Secretary Mayorkas has willfully abandoned his duty to secure the border and protect States against invasion, thereby violating Article IV, Section 4 of the Constitution.

To wit, since Mayorkas has headed the Department of Homeland Security,

there have been approximately 10 million illegal border crossers who have invaded our country at our border. This is broken down between 8 million encounters and approximately 1,800,000 known got-aways who have evaded United States authorities and are roaming the interior of the United States; at least 280 people on the terrorist watch lists caught while attempting to cross the border between ports of entry; approximately 400,000 unaccompanied illegal alien children encountered at the southern border, with at least 85,000 of these children having gone missing; at least 1,424 deaths of illegals at the southern border; approximately 73,000 special interest aliens arrested at our border, which are aliens from a nation that promotes terrorist activity, harbors terrorists, or poses a security threat to the United States. This is the number arrested at the border not counting however many of the 1,800,000 known got-aways are special interest aliens; approximately 659 special interest aliens from Iran; approximately 6,386 special interest aliens from Afghanistan; approximately 538 special interest aliens from Syria; approximately 3,153 special interest aliens from Egypt; approximately 12,624 special interest aliens from Uzbekistan; approximately 30,830 special interest aliens from Turkiye; approximately 1,613 special interest aliens from Pakistan; approximately 164 special interest aliens from Lebanon; approximately 185 special interest aliens from Jordan; approximately 123 special interest aliens from Iraq; and approximately 15,594 special interest aliens from Mauritania.

In fiscal year 2021, Customs and Border Patrol seized approximately 11,200 pounds of fentanyl. In fiscal year 2022, CBP seized approximately 14,700 pounds of fentanyl. In fiscal year 2023, CBP has seized a record of approximately 27,000 pounds of fentanyl. Over 70,000 Americans died from fentanyl in fiscal year 2022. Fentanyl is now the number one killer of Americans between the ages of 18 and 45. Fentanyl kills approximately 300 Americans a day. This is the amount of fentanyl that has been seized at the border, yet 300 Americans are being killed by fentanyl poisoning every day. The amount of unseized fentanyl has not even been taken into account.

The Constitution also requires the Secretary of Homeland Security to observe the Immigration and Nationality Act, (8 U.S.C. 1101). This law requires Homeland Security to detain inadmissible aliens arriving in the United States or illegal aliens presently in the United States. Instead, the Department of Homeland Security under Secretary Mayorkas has practiced catch and release policies, whereby illegals are detained but then released without any mechanism to ensure they show up to court for processing.

By terminating contracts for border wall construction, ending the migrant protection protocols, which is remain

in Mexico, unlawfully granting categorical parole, and being complicit in ending title 42, Mayorkas has made it easier for illegal aliens and drugs to enter the United States, endangering American citizens, and has made it harder for CBP to expel such threats.

Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas in his inability to enforce the law has engaged in a pattern of conduct that is incompatible with his duties as a civil officer of the United States.

Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas, in his failure to uphold the oath he took, has, by his actions, lost the trust of the citizens of the United States to faithfully execute the laws of the United States.

Wherefore, Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas thus warrants impeachment and trial, removal from office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any office of honor, trust, or profit under the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentlewoman from Georgia will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5283, PROTECTING OUR COMMUNITIES FROM FAILURE TO SECURE THE BORDER ACT OF 2023; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5961, NO FUNDS FOR IRANIAN TERRORISM ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S.J. RES. 32, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION RELATING TO “SMALL BUSINESS LENDING UNDER THE EQUAL CREDIT OPPORTUNITY ACT (REGULATION B)”

Mr. RESCENHALER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 891 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 891

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5283) to prohibit the use of Federal funds to provide housing to specified aliens on any land under

the administrative jurisdiction of the Federal land management agencies. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 118-15 shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5961) to freeze certain Iranian funds involved in the 2023 hostage deal between the United States and Iran, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment recommended by the Committee on Foreign Affairs now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 118-14, modified by the amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated

in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 32) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to "Small Business Lending Under the Equal Credit Opportunity Act (Regulation B)". All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to commit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. RESCENTIALER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RESCENTIALER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

□ 1230

Mr. RESCENTIALER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and in support of the underlying legislation.

House Resolution 891 provides for consideration of three measures: H.R. 5283, H.R. 5961, and S.J. Res. 32.

The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 5283, the Protecting our Communities from Failure to Secure the Border Act of 2023 under a structured rule, with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources or their respective designees, and provides one motion to recommit.

The rule makes in order two amendments.

Further, the rule provides for consideration of H.R. 5961, the No Funds for Iranian Terrorism Act under a structured rule, with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or their respective designees, and provides one motion to recommit.

The rule makes in order 12 amendments.

Finally, the rule provides for consideration of S.J. Res. 32, a resolution of Congressional disapproval related to a rule by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau on small business lending under a closed rule, with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services or their respective designees, and provides one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, since President Joe Biden took office, there have been 7.8 million illegal immigrant encounters, 1.7 million known got-aways, and hundreds of individuals on the terrorist watch list have been stopped at our southern border.

Instead of fixing this issue, the Biden administration and far-left radical Democrats have placed illegal immigrants in our public schools, in our airports, our police stations, and now our Federal lands.

In New York City, the Biden administration and far-left New York Democrats are housing hundreds of illegal immigrants on National Park Service land.

H.R. 5283 revokes New York City's lease and prevents all national parks and Federal lands from becoming tent cities.

Additionally, H.R. 5861 blocks President Biden's \$6 billion ransom gift to the Iranian regime.

As an Iraq war veteran, I have seen firsthand Iran's death and destruction in the Middle East. They are responsible for the deaths of hundreds, if not thousands, of Americans in the Middle East.

Since Hamas' attack on October 7 against our number one ally, Israel, Iranian-backed proxies have attacked U.S. forces over 70 times in Iraq and Syria.

This is unthinkable. What is more unthinkable is that on the 22nd anniversary of 9/11, the Biden administration announced \$6 billion in sanctions relief from the number one sponsor of terrorism, Iran.

These billions in sanctions relief will undoubtedly lead to more terrorist attacks, more attacks on Americans, and more attacks on innocent Israelis. That is why House Republicans will take action to freeze the funding that the Biden administration wants to send to the Ayatollah.

Lastly, the underlying legislation we will consider this week will address the Biden administration's CFPB guidance that places burdensome regulations on lenders and small business.

This new CFPB regulation will result in more compliance costs, it will create privacy concerns for small businesses, and adds to the bureaucratic regulatory environment that hinders hard-working Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. RESCHENTHALER), my colleague on the Committee on Rules, for yielding, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, once again, House Republicans are spending a week on legislation that fails to solve many of the very real issues facing our constituents.

Last week, when I was in my district, my constituents shared with me their aspirations, their worries, and their vision for how to make our communities thrive for generations. Veterans from Hobbs described how hard it is to travel for access to healthcare and other services—services that they have earned.

Seniors from Hobbs described the concern about paying their bills on a fixed income and the need to reduce costs. The Lovington mayor led us on a tour of the wastewater plant as he described the need to invest in water infrastructure in rural communities and thanked us for doing that and promoting such investment.

In Taos, New Mexico, ranchers and farmers working with the New Mexico Acequia Association, which for those of you who don't know, is a centuries-old system of providing irrigation to farmers and ranchers in New Mexico.

They talked to me about their concerns about growing their business amid the climate crisis that we are seeing and the drought conditions. These are real challenges that our constituents want us to fix, challenges that Congress has the ability and responsibility to address.

Does this rule make in order any bills to help address veterans' need to access healthcare?

Does it make in order any bills to help seniors pay their bills?

Does it help our rural communities access rural clean water systems?

Does it help our farmers keep their heritage and grow our foods?

Nope. It doesn't.

What are we doing this week?

We have a bill that prevents the use of Federal lands to provide temporary shelters for certain noncitizens, including migrants who are legally applying for asylum. It is a bill that fails to address the humanitarian crisis or security needs at our border.

Our colleagues across the aisle have consistently repeated harmful theories, like the invasion theory, where they seek to demonize the communities I represent and from which I come. Their talking points simply inflame the issue rather than looking to solve it.

This is just more of the same from a majority that is unable to govern effec-

tively. Instead, we should pass legislation that actually improves our immigration system and acknowledges and upholds the dignity of immigrant communities.

There are real solutions to deal with the border. The Republican majority just doesn't want us to vote on them on this floor.

For example, the Dream and Promise Act has vast support from Americans, but will we see Republicans put it on the floor?

Nope.

The Farmer Workforce Modernization Act that has bipartisan support would help agricultural communities and help farmworkers, but will we see Republicans put it on the floor?

Nope.

We could move these bills, if only Republicans would stop blocking them. We will also consider today a resolution to reverse a Consumer Financial Protection Bureau rule. That rule would require lenders to collect and report information about the small business credit applications they receive, including geographic and demographic data, lending decisions, and the price of credit.

We know that many rural small businesses struggle with access to financial resources. It is important to know whether or not the banks, especially the big banks, are serving them.

Americans, the middle class, and small businesses want somebody on their side because they know the big banks and corporations aren't. That is why Americans across the political spectrum overwhelmingly support the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

Despite the strong public support, Republicans continue to attack the Bureau. The Democrats are on the side of small businesses when we stand up for the Bureau and its work.

We should support initiatives to bring capital to entrepreneurs and innovators, especially in rural America. A lot of that work happens because of credit unions, I might add. I support efforts to address the credit unions' concerns about the smaller entities.

A CRA, though, as proposed by the Republicans, is an overly broad and blunt tool that prevents an agency from promulgating any regulation in an area that it addresses.

This CRA that they have put forward would tie the hands of the Bureau. It would prevent them from rulemaking regarding data for small businesses, women- and minority-owned businesses.

We need access to this data to make sure that small businesses, women- and minority-owned businesses, rural businesses have access to capital. Investing in these small businesses is how we grow the middle class, and that is what Democrats are focused on. How do we grow the middle class.

Lastly, H.R. 5961 would freeze certain Iranian funds involved in the 2023 hostage deal between the U.S. and Iran. We must acknowledge, and do acknowl-

edge, that Iran is dangerous and a state sponsor of terrorism. We cannot allow the terror to continue.

I must remind my Republican colleagues that the Rules Committee already reported a rule for this bill. Their own party blocked the House from voting on this bill when they voted down the rule on the floor.

This week we should be debating a bill with aid for our allies, including Israel, Ukraine, Taiwan, and others around the world, but I guess we are not.

I guess we should not be surprised with this rule. This is just a continuation of the chaos and closed process that has been a hallmark of this Republican-led House. We have seen over 40 closed rules on the floor that have blocked two-thirds of bipartisan amendments, including blocking half of all Republican amendments.

Republican leadership clearly hasn't made good on their promise to make the legislative process more open, inclusive, and accommodating.

This year, Republicans will have wasted nearly a month on internal politics just to elect a Speaker—time that could have been spent lowering costs for seniors and helping those veterans I mentioned earlier, time that could have been spent helping our farmers and ranchers, time that could have been spent helping to grow our middle class.

As Republicans continue to press forward legislation that seeks to further destroy and divide, House Democrats are working to improve the lives of everyday people.

House Democrats are committed to putting people over politics, to do what is right for everyday Americans; lowering costs, growing the middle class, and defending fundamental freedoms.

As we have all year, House Democrats continue to extend the hand of partnership to get things done for the American people, including passing legislation that invests in working families and keeping our Nation safe.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on this rule and a "no" vote on the underlying bills.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we are about to witness a real-time fact check here. My colleague from New Mexico is talking about the amount of closed rules. I would remind my friends across the aisle that in the 117th Congress—and that is when they were deciding which rules were going to be run—58 of their rules out of 89 were closed rules; that is approximately 61 percent. Spare me the lecture on closed rules.

We also have one bill coming to the floor that has 12 separate amendments. It is kind of rich hearing that criticism. What is even richer is the criticism that we, as Republicans, have done nothing about the border. Absolutely laughable.

As the Biden administration and far-left radical Democrats have ignored the southern border crisis, we passed H.R. 2 twice. Twice we passed it. I would invite any Democrat that actually wants to do something about the southern border to just vote for this underlying legislation that we are running.

Again, House Republicans have passed the Secure the Border Act of 2023. I will remind my friends across the aisle that act restarts construction of the border wall. It deploys advanced technology to the southern border. It increases Border Patrol agents and their pay. It strengthens and protects those provisions for unaccompanied minor children. It protects them from human trafficking, and it ends the disastrous policy of catch and release. It ends the catch and release policies of the far-left Democrats.

We have passed the FY24 Homeland Security Act as well that provides—wait for it—over \$2 billion for the border wall. It provides almost a half million dollars for 22,000 Border Patrol agents and billions in funding to remove dangerous criminals who have entered the United States interior illegally.

Now, this week, House Republicans will block the Biden administration and far-left radical Democrats from turning our Federal lands into the illegal immigrant housing that the Biden administration and far-left Democrats in our cities have turned them into.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. VAN DUYN).

Ms. VAN DUYN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution and to call attention to the ongoing crisis at our southern border.

President Biden and Secretary Mayorkas have turned our southern border into a land of lawlessness, triggering one of the worst national security, humanitarian, and public safety disasters our country has ever seen.

On day one, President Biden immediately repealed strong border security policies that were working. Under Biden and Mayorkas, we have shattered every illegal immigration record on the books, even as Mayorkas knowingly deceives Congress and the American people by saying, “our border is closed.”

This administration’s policies deliberately unleashed chaos by turning control of the border over to Mexican cartels and human traffickers, while simultaneously obstructing States’ efforts to secure the border and denying CBP and law enforcement officers the resources necessary to stop the flow of deadly drugs, human slaves, and, very likely, terrorist cells into our country.

As a Representative of the great State of Texas, I see the results, the consequences of these deadly policies every day throughout my State.

This bill is crucial for ensuring public policies and public spaces that are paid for with taxpayer dollars do not

become vast encampments for unvetted migrants, many of whom will be indebted to violent cartels.

□ 1245

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the passage of this important national security reform. It is clear that Secretary Mayorkas has no regard for the rule of law, and he does not take securing our border seriously.

Make no mistake, as long as Mayorkas remains in office, our border will remain unsecured and vulnerable to human and drug trafficking.

I stand firm in advocating for his impeachment, and I call on the Biden administration to offer border States the support they need to keep our communities safe.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This entire Congress, Republicans have tended to use titles for their bills that are extremely misleading. For example, today’s rule includes the so-called Protecting our Communities from Failure to Secure the Border Act. Interestingly, though, this bill does not actually secure the border. In fact, it does not include any resources for States to deal with migrants who are awaiting processing. How is that protecting our communities? Let’s invest where we need to address this issue.

Instead of addressing real problems at the border, Republicans are bringing up this unnecessary legislation to attack vulnerable migrants under the guise of protecting public lands. Remember, this is a public lands bill. It came out of the Natural Resources Committee. If they really cared about protecting public lands, they wouldn’t have passed an Interior appropriations bill out of their committee that cuts nearly a billion dollars from the Federal land management agencies that are tasked with protecting these public lands.

The concern really isn’t about protecting public lands, and it is not really about addressing the real immigration concerns. If they were really, truly interested in that, they would work with us to address the root causes of migration.

The most effective way to control the number of asylum-seekers arriving at our ports of entry is to help them stay in their home countries. They talk about that in some of their bills, but look at what they say and what they do.

Let’s focus on what they actually do. They have put forward appropriations bills that actually cut funding for customs and border officers. They cut CBP funding. They cut money for fentanyl interdiction. That is what they actually do.

They may have bills with fancy titles and all this talk, but what happens when it comes to what they are funding? They are not funding with the necessary resources to address these issues.

For example, the last time we were in the Rules Committee, they were cutting funding for the FBI, DEA, and law enforcement agencies that we need to work on these issues. They are not supporting the kind of cutting-edge inspection machines that we need to detect fentanyl at our southwestern border ports of entry, like in the President’s national security supplemental request.

I asked them if they were going to support the national security supplemental request with those provisions in it, if they were going to support the Democratic amendments in the border package earlier this year that would have made that bill better.

It is not a great bill. They focus on that wall. They are fixated on that wall. It is not what we need. We have seen report after report that it does not work. They just keep using migrants to score political points. This is the third bill we have seen this year, but none of them are true solutions.

If they were serious about solving the issues at our border, they would work with us on comprehensive legislation instead of these things that do absolutely nothing to fix the problem.

The problem isn’t in New York City. It is their failure to work with us on legislation that would solve the issue.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It is time for another real-time fact check, Mr. Speaker. Homeland FY 2024 increased funding for border agents, \$496 million for 22,000 new Border Patrol agents. That is the highest ever funded.

It is rich when I hear my colleagues from across the aisle talk about bills that are named one thing and do another. This is from a party that hung their entire term on the Inflation Reduction Act, which neither reduced inflation nor helped the economy. They later said that it was about preventing global warming. Again, it is rich coming from a party that often misnames their key legislation.

Let’s talk about sanctuary cities because there is one thing that we can do. We can end sanctuary city policies. For years, Democrats have criticized House Republicans and President Trump for wanting to secure our border and protect our communities. They criticize us when we say that. When the crisis comes to their own backyard instead of a small rural town on the southern border, when it comes to their sanctuary cities, Democrats are the first ones to declare an emergency.

Look at Martha’s Vineyard. When Ron DeSantis sent a few illegal immigrants to Martha’s Vineyard, it took those woke yuppies less than 12 hours to call the National Guard to remove the illegal immigrants. I am willing to bet there were more “Hate has no home here” signs in the pristine, well-manicured yards at Martha’s Vineyard

than actual illegal immigrants, but they still called the National Guard to remove those immigrants from Mar-tha's Vineyard.

Don't just take my word for it. Take New York City Mayor Eric Adams'. Over 110,000 migrants have reached New York City. Mayor Adams decried: "The national government has turned its back on New York City."

When illegal migrants showed up in Massachusetts, Governor Maura Healey declared a state of emergency and said the quiet part out loud: "Massachusetts has stepped up to address what sadly has been a Federal crisis of inaction that is many years in the making."

One thing is clear. Even Democrats now, in their sanctuary cities, are realizing that Biden has created this border crisis.

Democrats have ignored it for years. Republicans, thankfully, are finally stepping up and leading where they failed.

Any of my friends from across the aisle who want to help us, if they want to end this crisis, can vote for the rule today and vote for the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LANGWORTHY), my good friend.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding the time.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER talked about sanctuary policies. That is really at the root of what we are talking about here today, these so-called sanctuary policies of President Biden and Governor Kathy Hochul in New York and Mayor Eric Adams, who refuse to pull those sanctuary cities back. These policies have failed, and the American people are paying the consequences.

Millions of illegal immigrants have flooded across our border since President Biden took office. His administration has refused to even acknowledge the crisis that has unfolded.

Two years ago, it was only the communities along our southern border that seemed to almost exclusively carry this burden for this self-inflicted humanitarian crisis. Now, that burden is shared by cities, towns, and villages as far north as my own State of New York, where communities in my own district, very far from the southern border, in upstate New York, have declared a state of emergency as their limited resources are stretched to the breaking point to handle the influx of illegal immigrants.

Now, here we are, with thousands of migrant families, including children, shivering in tent cities at Floyd Bennett Field in Staten Island in New York City.

Mr. Speaker, moving forward, I hope my Democratic colleagues will think twice before accusing House Republicans of cruelty, callousness, or inhumanity when it comes to securing our border and fixing our broken immigration system.

Opening our borders to human traffickers and drug cartels, cramming migrant families into broken-down motels and freezing tent cities, and failing to account for 85,000 unaccompanied minors is the textbook definition of cruel, callous, and inhumane.

No longer will we allow this administration to divert and squander Federal resources, including our public lands, to shore up a crisis of their own making.

The solution to this crisis before us is extremely simple: Secure our border and uphold our immigration laws. Stop the invasion that has inundated the southern border and created a crisis in cities and towns across this country.

I strongly support this underlying legislation to end the Biden administration's encampments on America's public lands and hold this administration and those in our States and cities who have promoted so-called sanctuary policies accountable.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a letter of support for proposed section 1071, CFPB rule, which highlights the benefits of collecting lending demographic data for small farmers and farmers of color.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

NOVEMBER 27, 2023.

Support for CFPB Section 1071 Rule and Opposition to Congressional Review Act to Overturn 1071 Rule

Hon. MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. HAKEEM JEFFRIES,
Democratic Leader of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER JOHNSON AND LEADER JEFFRIES: We, the 84 undersigned organizations, write to express strong support for the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB)'s Section 1071 rule on Small Business Lending Data Collection under the Equal Credit Opportunity Act, and also to express strong opposition to any Congressional Review Act resolutions that would overturn CFPB Rule 1071.

Section 1071 of the Dodd-Frank Act amended the Equal Credit Opportunity Act (ECOA) to require financial institutions to compile, maintain, and submit to the Bureau certain data on applications for credit for all defined small businesses, including women and minority-owned small businesses. To be clear, Section 1071 is not optional—it is legally required by Dodd-Frank. CFPB's regulatory updates are designed to implement section 1071 as intended by Congress, and our organizations strongly support this effort.

The CFPB's regulatory updates are common sense efforts to improve the public's understanding of the impacts of lending, including agricultural lending, on-the-ground, and ultimately inform policy that is good for farmers, consumers, and our food and farm systems.

RULE 1071 IS PRO-FARMER AND PRO-MARKET

The Section 1071 rule is pro-farmer. Young, beginning, and small farmers have consistently demanded more transparent and fair markets. Having accurate and public data concerning the demographics primarily served by agricultural lenders will help farmers and consumers make better-informed financial decisions.

The Section 1071 rule is pro-market. The data required by Section 1071 will help lenders identify unmet credit needs and expand to new markets, especially in underserved communities. The rule contains no mechanism to penalize lenders based on the demographic data reported. Collecting loan applicant demographics is not new to the vast majority of lenders covered by this rule and many Farm Credit System lenders already collect home loan borrower demographics as required under the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act.

WHY AGRICULTURAL LENDING DATA IS CRITICAL

Creating effective and fair policy requires data. To help ensure collection of more robust data, it is critical that agricultural lenders—including those regulated by the Farm Credit Administration, whose mission is to "ensure that Farm Credit System institutions and Farmer Mac are safe, sound, and dependable sources of credit and related services for all creditworthy and eligible persons in agriculture and rural America—participate in demographic reporting.

Two Government Accountability Office reports support the application of Section 1071 to agricultural lending: *Agricultural Lending: Information on Credit and Outreach to Socially Disadvantaged Farmers and Ranchers is Limited*, and *Fair Lending: Data Limitations and the Fragmented U.S. Financial Regulatory Structure Challenge Federal Oversight and Enforcement Efforts*, which note that "Congress should consider requiring additional data collection and reporting for non-mortgage loans."

Transparent demographic data from agricultural lenders may provide insight on such trends as the dramatic decline of Black representation in farming and farmland ownership, as chronicled in several government records:

Federal Register announcement in Section 1002.104(A), "the share of minority representation in farming, particularly that of Black farmers, has declined sharply over the last 100 years." The precipitous decline is due in part to historical lack of access to credit for Black farmers from agricultural lenders. Yet, the absence of data collection requirements make evaluation challenging in the extreme.

Census Bureau 2019; USDA 2019: 90 percent of land accumulated by Black Farmers has been lost, and even though Black, Indigenous and other People of Color represent nearly one-quarter of the U.S. population, they operate less than 5 percent of the nation's declining number of farms, and cultivate less than 1 percent of its farmland.

Additionally, we also oppose H.R. 2423, the Farm Credit Administration Independent Authority Act, which would exempt the Farm Credit Administration from the CFPB Section 1071 rule.

CONCLUSION

The undersigned organizations urge you to support the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's strong support for the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB)'s Section 1071 rule on Small Business Lending Data Collection under the Equal Credit Opportunity Act, and also to express strong opposition to any Congressional Review Act resolutions that would overturn CFPB Rule 1071.

Sincerely,

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals

Americans for Financial Reform
Campaign for Family Farms and the Environment

CDFI Coalition

Center for Responsible Lending & Self-Help

Consumer Federation of America
 Farm Aid
 Farms to Grow, Inc.
 Fair Food Network
 Food Animal Concerns Trust
 Food Culture Collective
 Friends of the Earth
 HEAL (Health, Environment, Agriculture, Labor) Food Alliance
 Health Care Without Harm
 Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy
 Jubilee Justice
 National Association for Latino Community Asset Builders
 National Black Food and Justice Alliance
 National Community Reinvestment Coalition (NCRC)
 National Family Farm Coalition
 National LGBTQ Task Force
 National Sustainable Agriculture Coalition
 National Young Farmers Coalition
 North American Marine Alliance
 Not Our Farm
 Opportunity Finance Network
 Organic Farming Research Foundation
 Pesticide Action Network North America
 Real Food Media
 Revolving Door Project
 Rural Advancement Foundation International-USA (RAFI-USA)
 Rural Coalition
 Sustainable Agriculture and Food Systems Funders
 Union of Concerned Scientists
 Women, Food and Agriculture Network (WFAN)
 Woodstock Institute

LOCAL/STATE/REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

ALABAMA

Alabama State Association of Cooperatives
 CALIFORNIA

Avila Fund
 California FarmLink
 CAMEO (California Association for Micro Enterprise Opportunity)
 Community Alliance with Family Farmers
 Feed Black Futures
 Rise Economy (formerly California Reinvestment Coalition)
 San Diego Food System Alliance
 Urban Tilth

COLORADO

4th World Farm
 Nourish Colorado

DELAWARE

Delaware Community Reinvestment Action Council, Inc.

FLORIDA

Farmworker Association of Florida
 Florida Veterans for Common Sense

GEORGIA

Georgia Watch

ILLINOIS

Chicago Food Policy Action Council
 Illinois Food Justice Alliance

IOWA

Climate Land Leaders

MAINE

Coastal Enterprises, Inc.
 Maine Organic Farmers and Gardeners Association

MASSACHUSETTS

HCC Consulting
 Springfield Food Policy Council

MINNESOTA

Appetite For Change
 African Immigrant Farmers Alliance
 Bois Forte Food Sovereignty Group (Bois Forte Tribal Communities at Nett Lake and Lake Vermilion Reservations)
 Climate Land Leaders

Global GreenBiz
 Midwest Farmers of Color Collective
 Minnesota Farmers' Market Association
 Multicultural Kids Network
 Land Stewardship Project
 Renewing the Countryside
 Roots Return Heritage Farm LLC

NEW MEXICO

Agri-Cultura Cooperative Network
 La Semilla Food Center

NORTH CAROLINA

American Indian Mothers Inc
 Carolina Farm Stewardship Association
 Hawk's Nest Healing Gardens, LLC
 Toxic Free North Carolina

NEW YORK

Empire Justice Center
 Northeast Organic Farming Association of New York (NOFA-NY)
 Our Core Inc.
 Soul Fire Farm

OHIO

Ohio Ecological Food and Farm Association

PENNSYLVANIA

Pasa Sustainable Agriculture

SOUTH CAROLINA

Carolina Farm Stewardship Association

SOUTH DAKOTA

Climate Land Leaders

VIRGINIA

Cultivate Charlottesville

WEST VIRGINIA

Partner Community Capital

WISCONSIN

Climate Land Leaders
 Midwest Farmers of Color Collective

Ms. **LEGER FERNANDEZ**. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This letter tells us a lot about how Democrats see the issues in rural America, how Democrats see the issues affecting our small businesses, our women-owned businesses, and our minority-owned businesses. It is one of wanting to make sure that the playing field is level, that there is transparency and fairness at the same time that we use the market to build up thriving communities.

This is a letter that comes from ranchers, farmers, cooperatives, our rural areas. It is signed by dozens of organizations, and they read that the section 1071 rule is profarmer. Young, beginning, and small farmers have consistently demanded more transparent and fair markets.

Having accurate and public data will help farmers and consumers make better-informed financial decisions.

For some reason, the Republicans don't want to make sure that we have access to this data. What are they hiding? If big banks aren't serving our rural farmers, let's find that out.

This isn't just about that. This is about promarket. They say section 1071 is promarket. The data required by section 1071 will help lenders identify unmet credit needs and expand new markets.

This is important if we are going to grow the middle class. Once again, I was a small business owner. I had a woman-owned business. I went and

sought credit. I filled out those forms. It wasn't that hard. I wrote down that, yes, I am a woman-owned business, and, yes, I am a minority-owned business. I am a Latina. I am proud of it. I am from a State capital, by the way, the oldest State capital in the United States, which is very pro-immigrant because we know of the economic benefits it provides.

We know that having access to this information is good for our small businesses. It is good for rural America. Therefore, we are very much in support of this rule, despite the fact that, once again, Republicans want to hammer and beat up the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau despite the great work it does for our consumers, the great work it does for our small businesses, the great work it does for Americans, which is why they support it the way they do.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide for consideration of a measure that clearly states that the people's House will keep its solemn promise to American seniors and workers. We will protect and preserve Social Security and Medicare and fight against any cuts to these crucial programs that so many of our constituents depend on.

Reaffirming our promise is more important than ever. Republicans on the Budget Committee today, as we speak, are holding a hearing about fiscal commissions that could slash Social Security and Medicare. We cannot allow that to happen.

The top candidates for President in the Republican Party are also calling for cuts to Social Security. The House must stand against that. Democrats in the House will stand against that.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment into the RECORD, along with any extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURPHY). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Ms. **LEGER FERNANDEZ**. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. LEE) to discuss our proposal.

Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the grandmas and grandpas and moms and dads and neighbors and beloved community members who spent their entire lives paying into Medicare out of their own paychecks on the sacred promise that they could retire with health and dignity only to have that promise betrayed by today's Republican Party.

I stand here on behalf of our aging parents and sons and daughters fighting mental illness, loved ones who are cancer patients and stroke survivors, workers injured on the job, orphaned children, and siblings with disabilities, whose access to food, shelter, medicine,

and dignified retirement depends on Social Security that Republicans are hellbent on tearing away.

□ 1300

In Pennsylvania alone, 2.8 million folks depend on Medicare—227,727 in Allegheny County—and 2.9 million depend on Social Security—nearly 150,000 in my district alone. Every one of them deserves to retire in dignity with access to healthcare. Every one of them deserves a Congress where every Member has the decency to honor that sacred promise not to leave our families behind at the hardest moments of their lives.

The reality is that just about every American agrees, no matter where we come from, how we vote, or what our skin color is—we all deserve those things.

The Republican Party, bought out by greedy CEOs, billionaires, and lobbyists, have always been terrified of that reality. They are so terrified that instead of facing it they have chosen to lie, scapegoat, and defraud even the folks who elected them, assuming we are too foolish to see what is going on.

Let me break it down. First, Republicans passed tax handouts for their filthy rich donors promising a trickle-down miracle that never has and will never happen from Reaganomics to the Trump tax scam.

When their tax scam causes the economy to slow and deficits to grow, they refuse to correct their mistake. Instead, they blame immigrants, poor folks, Black folks, and Brown folks.

Next, Republicans pretend to panic and call for devastating cuts to Social Security and Medicare that would force Americans to work longer for less and tear away their hard-earned retirement and end Medicare as we know it—reducing spending.

They call for more handouts for their billionaire donors and corporate polluters. They hope that you will settle for tearing away your neighbors' lifelines to protect your own right to retire in dignity, forcing us to the brink of catastrophic shutdown or debt ceiling crisis until we clean up their mess.

They repeat the cycle hoping enough of us will forgive and forget their scheme to tear away Medicare and Social Security and believe their lie that they were only after food assistance, healthcare, or housing for poor folks—not your earned benefits. The truth is that they always were and always will be after it all.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania.

Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as I speak, Republicans on the Budget Committee are holding a hearing to establish a death panel commission to gut earned benefits where their chairman called his party's fight to tear Social Security our generation's world war.

At a time when the majority of Pennsylvanians say they struggle to afford healthcare and half are delaying getting the medical care they need because they can't afford it, we as Democrats have an obligation to fight to not only protect Social Security and Medicare but expand them.

If we preserve the retirement age, increase benefits to keep up with inflation, expand Medicare to include vision, dental, and hearing, and hold Big Pharma price gougers accountable and pass Medicare for All, that is how we fulfill our sacred promise and move our country and our economy forward.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so we can bring up legislation that reaffirms the House of Representatives' commitment to protecting and strengthening Social Security and Medicare.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know if my colleague from Pennsylvania was talking about the party as in 2003 or 2023 because the last time I checked, the Republicans are the party that supports the guys that shower after work not before.

The Chamber of Commerce has picked its side. It is with the Democrats. The billionaires that my friend from Pittsburgh was talking about—check how they are registered to vote. I am pretty sure—and I am willing to bet—that they all registered as Democrats, and far-left, extreme Democrats, by the way. All the Big Tech CEOs, Apple and Amazon, you name it, they are all far-left Democrats.

So this nostalgia for the day when Republicans supported big business and Democrats supported the little guy, it is just that, it is nostalgia. It is 2023, and we need to realize the new political realities.

When we are talking about numbers, I noticed that my friend from Pennsylvania didn't talk about the numbers relating to the destruction of Hamas during the over 3 minutes she had to address the Chamber. Let's talk about those numbers.

Hamas has killed over 1,500 Israelis since October 7, 2023. They have killed over 1,500 Israelis. They have injured over 6,900. Over 230 hostages were taken by Hamas in the Gaza Strip. Over 9,500 rockets have been fired from Gaza toward Israel. There were 32 Americans killed and several Americans are still missing.

While we are throwing out numbers, let's not forget to talk about the destruction Hamas has brought.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, actually the debate around Social Security, similar to the debate about the Consumer Protection Bureau and its regulations, does highlight the policies that the Democrats

and Republicans pursue and who are the beneficiaries of those policies.

Let's look at Social Security and what the Republican Budget Committee is looking at. They are looking at raising the retirement age. Who actually pays for that?

When you raise the retirement age, it is going to be the janitors, nurses, educators, and the people doing the hard work in our manufacturing plants that are going to be required to work longer. They are going to be the ones who are going to have a hard time because they don't have additional savings like the wealthy. Right?

The wealthy aren't going to care about whether you raise the age to 67, 68, or 72 because they have the assets and they are not relying on Social Security. It is our workers who have paid into Social Security who have earned it and deserve it. They deserve to receive the benefits that we promised them when they started working and paying into the system.

What can we do to make sure that Social Security is solvent in the future?

Well, Democrats have a bill that we introduced last year, and we supported it this year. You make sure everybody pays—no matter how much money you make—into the system. Right now we know that the wealthy stop paying into the system at about \$147,000.

Why doesn't everybody pay Social Security taxes on all their earnings?

Why aren't the wealthy paying their fair share?

That is a policy difference. It is the policy distinctions that we are focused on.

Once again, Democrats are standing with working Americans who are not earning \$200,000, \$300,000, \$400,000, or \$1 million a year. We say you should pay your fair share of your Social Security taxes rather than doing what they want to do, which is gut benefits. When you raise the Social Security age, you are gutting the benefits.

That is an example of the distinction of when you are standing with working Americans and when your policies that you support are increasing the middle class instead of standing with the wealthy.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, here is another real-time fact-check for you. Obama under ObamaCare took \$700 billion from Medicare. You tell me who is trying to protect Medicare and Medicaid. It certainly wasn't the Obama administration when they were taking billions of dollars from the fund.

It is amazing the amount of time that my colleagues across the aisle talk about working families. Have they actually talked to working families?

When I am in my district talking to working families, not the woke yuppies

that my friends across the aisle represent, but actually working Americans, they are talking about inflation. Let's look at the numbers.

When President Biden took office, President Trump had inflation where it was just 1.4 percent. Since then, prices have risen by 17 percent. By the way, real wages are going down, hurting working families and working Americans.

Prices have risen 17 percent and real wages are down. Credit card, auto loan, and consumer loan delinquencies are at the highest levels since the Great Recession. Just this morning, CBS News—the conservative news bash—reported that Americans need an extra \$11,400 today just to afford the basics when compared to when President Trump was in office.

You tell me who is looking out for the working American. Something tells me it is not extreme, far-left Democrats that are looking out for their woke, affluent suburbs. All the while, the President has been misleading the American people.

Last week, our 81-year-old leader claimed Thanksgiving dinner was the fourth cheapest ever on record. Of course, that was false. Maybe it is his age showing, I don't know, but the truth is that it was the second most expensive Thanksgiving dinner ever.

If you want to talk about an all-time high, last year's inflation under the President's watch is an all-time high. It is clear, Bidenomics is broken economics. Democrats do not care about working Americans. Republicans do.

Let's talk about some more Bidenomics statistics. With the economy adding just 1,500 jobs in October, coming in below expectations, this is the second worst jobs report of the Biden Presidency.

The unemployment rate rose to 3.9 percent in October where the labor force participation rate actually declined. The average middle-class household has lost over \$33,000 in real wealth in just this past year. That hurts people that are driving to work, driving to construction sites, and driving to work shifts at diners. It is not hurting the woke, yuppie base that the Democrats represent sitting at home on Zoom all day, having their EVs charging in their garage.

The average rate for a 30-year fixed mortgage is now at the highest level since 2000. This is bringing a disastrous effect to the housing market. Homeownership has been deemed unaffordable in 99 percent of the country. There are 73 percent of Americans that believe the economy is in bad shape, and more voters trust Republicans over Democrats to handle inflation, according to a recent AP-NORC poll.

Mr. Speaker, 58 percent of the Americans believe the economy is getting worse, and 69 percent believe the country is on the wrong track, according to an Economist/YouGov poll. That is not exactly a far-right polling outfit.

Half of Americans say their financial situation is worsening, according to a recent Harvard CAPS/Harris Poll. Biden's approval rating on the economy is at just 32 percent, the lowest of his Presidency, according to CNBC's All-American Economic Survey.

It is very clear that the American people know that Biden and far-left Democrats are hurting not only their job prospects, not only their ability to afford a home, but the entire economy and their ability just to afford the basics.

Mr. Speaker, I question any time a Democrat tells me they are watching out for the working American.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think we need to remember why we faced inflation in the first place. We need to remember that this country and the world faced down a pandemic that threatened to destroy our economy.

Let's go back to those dark days when we moved from the Trump Presidency to the Biden Presidency. Our businesses were closed. Our Main Streets were going to fall apart. Our city, local, and State governments were worried about whether they would be able to keep people on the payroll.

The Democrats passed the American Rescue Plan, and we did rescue the economy indeed. I go to my working-class district because my entire district is like that. That is my family. I come from those roots. I speak to those people on a regular basis.

Every town I go into, I look at the number of loans, the PPP, the Restaurant Revitalization Fund, the Shuttered Venue Operators Grant, and they are open now. Those communities are thriving because of the work we did. That was not the reason we saw inflation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an article from the Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City Economic Review.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

[From the Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City]

HOW MUCH HAVE RECORD CORPORATE PROFITS CONTRIBUTED TO RECENT INFLATION?

(By Andrew Glover, José Mustre-del-Río, and Alice von Ende-Becker)

Inflation ended 2021 at a 40-year high and rose further in 2022. Policymakers, politicians, and pundits have considered many possible explanations for this burst of inflation, from transitory supply chain disruptions to “wage-price spirals” to mismatches between demand and supply. However, one potential explanation that has received significant public attention is “greedflation”—that is, the idea that firms are capitalizing on their market power by raising their prices higher and faster than the growth in their production costs. This idea is well captured by Robert Reich's May 17, 2022, testimony to

Congress, during which he said, “When corporations are so flush with cash, why are they raising prices?” They are not raising prices solely because of the increasing costs of supplies and components and of labor. . . . Corporations enjoying record profits in a healthy competitive economy would absorb these costs. Why? Because they can. And they can because they don't face meaningful competition” (p. 2).

Although higher corporate profits have received attention recently, profits and inflation do not have a direct accounting relationship. However, inflation is directly affected by growth in the markup—the ratio between the price a firm charges and the firm's current marginal cost of production. Inflation in a firm's prices is therefore the sum of the growth in the marginal cost of production and the growth in the markup.

Economic theory posits many ways that markups can change over time. For example, markups could change due to a decrease in the price sensitivity of consumer demand or an increase in monopoly power that arises from reduced competition. However, markups could also rise if current marginal costs become less important for a firm's pricing, either because current firms expect higher costs to replace current inventory as it is sold or because firms expect higher marginal costs in the future and want to smooth out price increases over time rather than raise prices sharply and abruptly. In this article, we estimate the 2021 growth rate of markups and discuss likely contributors to this growth. We find evidence that markup growth was a major contributor to inflation in 2021. Specifically, markups grew by 3.4 percent over the year, whereas inflation, as measured by the price index for Personal Consumption Expenditures (PCE), was 5.8 percent, suggesting that markups could account for more than half of 2021 inflation. Such high markup growth is especially striking given that markup growth contributed almost nothing to inflation in the decade leading up to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Although our estimate suggests that markup growth was a major contributor to annual inflation in 2021, it does not tell us why markups grew so rapidly. We present evidence that the timing and cross-industry patterns of markup growth are more consistent with firms raising prices in anticipation of future cost increases, rather than an increase in monopoly power or higher demand. First, the timing of markup growth in 2021, as well as earlier in the pandemic, does not line up neatly with the spike in inflation during the second half of 2021. Instead, the largest growth in markups occurred in 2020 and the first quarter of 2021; in the second half of 2021, markups actually declined. Therefore, inflation cannot be explained by a persistent increase in market power after the pandemic. Second, if monopolists raising prices in the face of higher demand were driving markup growth, we would expect firms with larger increases in current demand to have accordingly larger markups. Instead, markup growth was similar across industries that experienced very different levels of demand (and inflation) in 2021. This finding suggests that an increase in markups may provide policymakers with a signal of future inflationary pressures, especially if it occurs during periods where expectations of near-term future inflation are heightened.

Section I reviews the microeconomic theory of price setting by monopolists while holding constant marginal costs and demand. Section II presents our estimates of markup growth across time and industries. Section III extends the theory of pricing to one where firms must consider future marginal costs when setting current prices and demonstrates how an increase in expected future marginal costs translates to inflation

through markup growth in the present followed by negative markup growth in the future.

1. PRICES, COSTS, AND MARKUPS IN THE MODEL OF MONOPOLISTIC COMPETITION

Rising monopoly power among firms has been a popular explanation for the 2021 spike in inflation, buttressed by a coincident rise in corporate profits. To help illustrate the mechanisms through which monopoly power can raise markups, Figure 1 first shows how markups are determined in a standard monopolistic model of price setting holding a firm's marginal costs fixed. The solid blue line shows that consumers' maximum willingness to pay (that is, their demand for the good) declines as they purchase more of a monopolistic firm's product. The dashed blue line shows that the marginal revenue a monopolist receives from each additional sale declines as they increase output. Finally, the solid green line plots the marginal cost of producing each unit sold.

A profit-maximizing monopolist chooses the price that equates marginal revenue to marginal cost, so any change in price would lead to a loss in profits. For example, in Figure 1, if the monopolist sets a unit price equal to \$4, consumers will demand (and purchase) three units. Because the monopolist's production cost is only \$1 per unit, they earn \$3 profit per unit for a total profit of \$9 and a markup equal to 4 ($\$4/\$1 = 4$). This price equates marginal revenue to marginal cost and maximizes the monopolist's profit. If the monopolist decides to lower the price to \$3, they would sell four units instead of three, but their profit per unit would fall to \$2 for a total profit of \$8 instead of \$9 and a markup of 3. Similarly, if the monopolist raised the price to \$5, then they would make \$4 profit on each unit but sell only two units at that price for a total profit of \$8 and a markup of 5.

Figures 2 and 3 illustrate how markups and costs jointly determine inflation by showing how the monopolist will increase their price in response to either an increase in the marginal cost or an increase in demand. Figure 2 shows that an increase in the firm's marginal cost from \$1 to \$5—represented by the solid orange line—will raise the unit price by \$2, from \$4 to \$6. In this case, the firm's markup declines from 4 to 1.2 ($\$6/\$5 = 1.2$); even though the price level increases, it is driven by the increase in marginal cost and markup growth is actually negative. In contrast, Figure 3 shows that an increase in demand—represented by the solid orange line—causes prices to grow from \$4 to \$5. In this case, the firm's markup increases from 4 to 5, so the increase in the price level in Figure 3 is entirely due to the firm's markup growing.

In summary, changes in firms' current marginal costs or demand for their products can contribute to inflation as firms adjust their prices to maximize profits. The total change in prices can always be understood as the combined effects of changes in the marginal cost of production and changes in the firm's markup. Our simple model shows that markups may or may not contribute to inflation: when a monopolist's marginal costs increase, markups decline, but when demand for a monopolist's products increases, markups rise.

II. ESTIMATES OF AVERAGE MARKUPS

Although the figures in the previous section provide simple illustrations of arm markups, measuring the growth rate of these markups in the real economy can be challenging. First, data on a firm's marginal cost of production are not available; instead, we can only observe measures of total costs in nominal values. Second, data collected at the firm level do not report the prices that firms charge or the quantity of goods they produce, but rather their total sales.

To overcome these challenges, we estimate the growth rate in markups by assuming that firms equate their marginal cost to a constant proportion of the production costs that they can control—specifically, variable costs, which include things like labor and utilities, rather than fixed costs, such as depreciation on previously installed capital. This assumption allows us to proxy a firm's markup growth using the growth in its ratio of sales to variable costs. We estimate markup growth using Compustat data, which consist of quarterly data at the firm level for publicly traded corporations in the United States. These data have been used widely to estimate markups (as in De Loecker, Eeckhout, and Unger 2020) and have two main benefits. First, they allow us to estimate markups at the firm level and then calculate averages at different sectoral levels of aggregation. Second, they include a direct estimate of total variable costs, “cost of goods sold,” which is our basis for estimating markups.

The blue line in Chart 1 plots average markup growth across all firms from 2011 through 2021, weighted by share of total sales. The chart shows that after remaining roughly flat in the decade preceding the pandemic and falling by 0.5 percent in 2020, markups grew by about 3.4 percent in 2021. This is more than half of the 5.8 percent PCE inflation rate, suggesting markup growth played a major role for inflation in 2021. Furthermore, the burst in markup growth seen in 2021 stands in marked contrast to the decade before the pandemic, when marginal cost growth drove inflation and markup growth averaged only 0.42 percent (less than one-third of average PCE inflation over that period).

Looking at the timing of markup growth tells a more nuanced story. Chart 2 shows quarterly markup growth plotted against quarterly PCE inflation. We estimate that quarterly markup growth was highest in 2021:Q1, when it neared 16 percent (annualized), while quarterly inflation was only 4.6 percent. Furthermore, markups fell in the second half of 2021, while inflation accelerated. This suggests that the source of high markup growth in recent years was not a steady increase in monopoly power.

As shown in the previous section, changes in demand can also drive markup growth, even if monopoly power is unchanged. However, if high-frequency changes in demand were generating fluctuations in markup growth, then we would expect industries with higher demand to have both higher inflation and higher markup growth than those with less demand.

We check for this pattern using the industrial detail of our Compustat markup measure. Goods and services experienced different rates of inflation in 2020 and 2021, as shown in the first three bars in Chart 3. Durable goods inflation spiked sharply to nearly 11 percent, nondurable goods inflation grew by 7.4 percent, and services inflation remained relatively low at 4.3 percent. These differences likely reflect shifts in relative demand in the face of ongoing COVID-19 risk in 2021, as spending on durable goods has a relatively low risk of infection compared with spending on services. However, the green bars in Chart 3 show that the pattern for markup growth in roughly comparable industries was much more similar. Markups grew only slightly more in manufacturing (2.90 percent) than in services (2.20 percent), and retail saw the smallest growth in markups (0.33 percent). The similarity of markup growth despite large differences in inflation speaks against a simple demand-based explanation in which markups drove inflation most for industries that experienced the strongest increase in relative demand due to the pandemic.

III. HIGHER FUTURE MARGINAL COSTS INCREASE MARKUPS WHEN PRICING IS DYNAMIC

Although markup growth was high in 2021, the evidence from the previous section casts doubt on the simple explanation of “greedflation,” understood as either an increase in monopoly power or firms using existing power to take advantage of high demand. Instead, this evidence may be consistent with an alternative explanation: that firms are raising markups in the present to smooth price increases they expect in the future. Indeed, both the hump shape of aggregate markup growth and similarity in markup growth across industries arise naturally in standard macroeconomic models where firms adjust their prices slowly over time and expect high marginal costs in the near-term future.

To understand how markups can rise in response to an increase in firms' expectations of higher marginal costs in the future, we extend our theory of price setting to one with multiple periods of production and sales as well as “sticky” prices. We consider a firm that has a marginal cost of \$1 at the beginning of the year (as in Figure 1) but expects their marginal cost to rise to \$5 in the next year (as in Figure 2). However, we assume that this firm will only set its price once for both years, either because it is costly to adjust prices or because consumers dislike frequent price changes. Of course, this illustrative model cannot also generate inflation after markups have fallen, as we see in the data, but we extend it to a longer horizon below.

Figure 4 demonstrates profits as the firm considers prices between \$4 (which maximizes profits given a constant marginal cost of \$1) and \$6 (which maximizes profits given a constant marginal cost of \$5). Using either price of \$4 or \$6 for both periods generates a total profit of \$6. However, if the firm sets a price of \$5, then profits rise to \$8. Effectively, this balances the average of the marginal cost between the two years to the marginal revenue, thereby maximizing total profit. Markups are therefore higher initially—when the marginal cost is \$1, firms set a price of \$5, leading to a first-year markup of 5 rather than 4. However, markups fall in the second year—when marginal costs rise to \$5 and the price remains at \$5, then the markup is equal to 1. In other words, the firm just breaks even on the last unit sold in the second year.

Although this simple example illustrates how higher future marginal costs can increase inflation in the present via markups, it is much simpler than the dynamic equilibrium models used by policymakers, which allow firms to engage in many periods of price setting, households to make consumption and labor supply decisions (which determine firms' demand and wage costs), and monetary policy to change interest rates in response to inflation (which affects household spending). Figure 5 demonstrates inflation (blue line) and markup growth (green line) from such a model in which prices, output, and interest rates are all determined jointly in equilibrium following a monetary policy rule that leads the central bank to raise interest rates when inflation rises. In this simulation, firms realize that marginal costs will rise by 10 percent in a year and then shrink slowly, returning to normal after two years. In anticipation, they begin raising prices immediately, which translates into markup growth and inflation. Furthermore, in the model, the increase in inflation elicits an increase in interest rates by the central bank, which in turn lowers employment and reduces marginal costs (through lower real wages). The result is that markup growth initially accounts for more than 100

percent of inflation, which is why the green line is initially above the blue line. Once marginal costs rise, however, inflation is higher than markup growth, and eventually markups begin to shrink. The qualitative pattern of markup growth's contribution to inflation is remarkably similar to the quarterly pattern of inflation and markup growth in 2021. Furthermore, the initial markup-driven increase in inflation foreshadows the later increase in marginal costs and signals a persistent rise in inflation. Overall, this example's accordance with the quarterly data from 2021 suggests that the large contribution of markups to inflation in 2021 may have been a harbinger of the continued inflation observed in 2022.

CONCLUSION

As inflation has remained stubbornly high, economists and policymakers have sought to better understand the contribution to price gains from direct increases in marginal costs versus increases in firms' markups. We show that markup growth likely contributed more than 50 percent to inflation in 2021, a substantially higher contribution than during the preceding decade. However, the markup itself is determined by a host of unobservable factors, including changes in demand but also changes in firms' expectations of future marginal costs. The decline in markups during the first half of 2022—even as inflation remained high—is consistent with firms having raised markups during 2021 in anticipation of future cost pressures. Furthermore, the growth in markups was similar across industries with very different relative demand and inflation rates in 2021, which is also consistent with an aggregate increase in expected future marginal costs. We conclude that an increase in markups likely provides a signal that price setters expect persistent increases in their future costs of production.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, this is an article titled: "How Much Have Record Corporate Profits Contributed to Recent Inflation?"

Firms raised markups to 2021 in anticipation of future cost pressures contributing to about 60 percent. Every American knows that record profits added to inflation. They just keep on trying to blame it on the fact that we kept our small businesses open. That is not the case. We made sure that people did not get thrown out of their homes.

It is the big corporations that they protect with their policies, and they want to make sure that they can cheat on their taxes. They bring that up every little while. He brought up issues with regard to Israel. Well, you know, they didn't allow a clean bill to come to the floor because they wanted to make sure that tax cheats could continue cheating on their taxes. They wanted to cut that funding.

□ 1315

We know that those kinds of things hurt America. We know that part of the reason for inflation was because of Putin's war, Putin's invasion of Ukraine, and what happened to the markets from that.

On that side of the aisle, we have the Putin protectors who are fighting back and do not want to provide any resources to Ukraine.

So, the majority should not start talking to me about inflation when the

majority's policies are continuing to add to those problems.

You might know, Mr. Speaker, that neither this Congress nor this Presidency controls interest rates. That is the Federal Reserve. We do not control that. The President does not control that.

I would love to see interest rates come down because they do impact jobs. The fact that we had the lowest job growth of the Biden administration tells you—oh, my God, you had to compare it just to the Biden administration because the job growth has been phenomenal under this administration. It has been phenomenal based on the policies of what we did in the last Congress. We have added so many jobs.

We are seeing that the Inflation Reduction Act is bringing down inflation. Inflation is lower now than it was 1 year ago. Fact-check that. Yes, indeed, we have brought down inflation.

We are creating good manufacturing jobs. In New Mexico, we are creating manufacturing jobs. We are now manufacturing wind turbines. We are manufacturing solar facilities. We are manufacturing more now in New Mexico than we have done in the past.

Those are the kinds of things that are being created with the policies that Democrats supported and were signed into law last Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for another real-time fact check. By the way, let's not conflate interest rates with inflation. They are two totally separate things.

Let's talk about inflation. My friend from New Mexico said that inflation started during COVID. We know that when President Trump left office, inflation was at 1.4 percent. In June 2022, when Biden was in office, it was 9.1 percent. That is almost a record high. Yes, inflation is slightly less than it was, coming down from the all-time high.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, facts don't care about your feelings, and they don't care about your political persuasion. Try arguing the difference between 9.1 percent inflation and 1.4 percent inflation. Good luck with that.

We all know who is to blame: Biden and far-left, radical Democrats.

Also, to talk about how great the economy is and unemployment, the unemployment rate actually rose in October to 3.9 percent while the labor force participation rate declined. It is actually worse than 3.9 percent if you are reading into that statistic, Mr. Speaker.

Again, this is quite amazing. Not only has President Biden totally botched the economy and Bidenomics, but he has repeatedly botched foreign affairs. Obama's own Defense Secretary, Robert Gates, once said that Joe Biden has managed to get every single foreign policy decision wrong in his entire career.

One of the big mistakes that Biden made, when we talk about foreign affairs, was when he decided to delist the Houthis as a terrorist organization. Here is a quick history lesson. In 2021, due to pressure from the Iranian regime, and for whatever reason the Biden administration is fixated on appeasing the Iranian regime, the Iranian regime was putting pressure on the Biden administration to delist the Houthis as a foreign terrorist organization. For those who don't know, the Houthis are an Iranian-backed proxy group that wreaks havoc across the Middle East.

In recent weeks, the Houthis have carried out drone and missile attacks against Israel. They have attacked and seized commercial vessels in the Red Sea. They have fired rockets at the U.S. Navy, including the USS *Mason*, the USS *Thomas Hudner*, and the USS *Kearny*.

It is past time for the Biden administration to get tough with Iran and designate the Houthis as the foreign terrorist organization that they are.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and I am prepared to close.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, let me respond to the comment about not talking about interest rates. The gentleman talked about mortgage rates, and mortgage rates are tied to the Federal Reserve. So, once again, understanding how our economy works and which agency and entity has control over that is very important.

I also want to talk about the idea of who is trusted. He mentioned some polls with regard to who is trusted on the economy. The reality is that we are right now in the people's House. We are the Representatives who are closest to the people and who are out there meeting with them. This is what the Founders intended. When the Founders created the House of Representatives, they wanted to make sure that we were a miniature of America and that we were in constant communication.

I know that that is what we do. I know that is what my colleagues do and what I do. We go out and talk with them. We listen to their stories and bring them back. We decide, based on what we hear, what we are going to prioritize.

I like the fact that Democrats, that my party, those of us on this side of the aisle, go out to listen and come back and push for policies that are going to lower costs, like the Inflation Reduction Act did where we lowered the cost of prescription drugs and where we made sure that nobody is going to pay more than \$35 a month for insulin. People have been asking for that.

For the first time, we are going to negotiate with Big Pharma to bring down those costs where there is going to be a \$2,000 out-of-pocket limit for

prescription drugs. These are important ways in which we are lowering costs.

We are lowering costs by making sure that we are providing homeowners and renters with the ability to lower their energy costs, whether that is putting in renewable energy facilities and solar panels or insulating homes.

Those are the kinds of things that my colleagues across the aisle, my good friends, might not understand, like how important it is to insulate your house. I am from where it is cold, so getting those insulation credits is important. It lowers costs.

Because of this work that we have done, I know that there is an aggregated poll out that points to the fact that Democrat incumbents are trusted in the House at a rate that is so further beyond our Republicans. They are underwater by 14 points. Their own constituents know that they are not fighting for their economic benefit.

Nevertheless, what we have seen this year is chaos and dysfunction take over the House under Republican leadership. While Democrats have been ready to put people over politics and deliver for America through bipartisan legislation, our colleagues across the aisle continue to introduce bills like we are considering today that focus more on culture wars and nonsolutions.

Today, we have an immigration bill that does not address the root causes of migration, offer solutions for our broken systems, or provide any resources to help the U.S. citizenship or immigration system or Customs and Border Patrol address an increase in migrants.

In this bill, they might talk about a lot of things, but that is not what this bill does. This bill does not address any of those key issues. Instead, it restricts the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture's ability to manage their lands. These agencies are in charge of managing our public lands, and we need to let them do their job.

We have a bill that fails to help our small businesses even when we know that SBA low-interest loans have helped thousands of entrepreneurs grow their businesses and the economy. Instead, they would seek to make those Federal loans less transparent and would cripple the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's ability to address disparities in lending.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RESCIENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I can't believe that, once again, I am here on the House floor explaining to my friends across the aisle that there is a difference between interest rates and inflation. They are two separate things. They shouldn't be conflated. I am shocked that I have to explain this to Members who are elected to Congress. It is quite amazing.

It is very clear, the difference between inflation and interest rates.

There is another thing that is very clear that Democrats don't seem to understand, and that is that President Biden's foreign policy agenda benefits our foreign adversaries and not the American people. From the failed withdrawal from Afghanistan to the \$6 billion in sanctions relief to Iran, to the draining of our Strategic Petroleum Reserve and also the fast-tracking of Putin's Nord Stream 2 project, it has been disastrous.

Mr. Speaker, look at the invasion of Ukraine, a terrorist safe haven in Afghanistan, an emboldened China, and a destabilized Middle East. This legislation before us will protect our service-members in the Middle East. It will place additional pressure on the Iranian regime.

Additionally, we have another Biden-fueled disaster right here at home at our southern border. The White House now wants to exacerbate this crisis further by placing tent cities on Federal lands.

In Pennsylvania, our Commonwealth is home to several national parks, including the Flight 93 National Memorial, Fort Necessity National Battlefield, and Friendship Hill National Historic Site, all of which are in my congressional district. These are places for Americans and their families, not camps for those who broke our laws and are here illegally.

The underlying legislation will protect our national parks from the Biden administration's and the Democrats' radical, far-left immigration policies.

Finally, the Biden administration's attempt to burden our local lenders with extra costs would do irreparable harm to our Nation's 33 million small businesses. During a time when Bidenomics is failing the American people, it is critical we support efforts to make the American Dream more achievable, not insert partisan politics into small business lending. That is why the House will nullify this far-left, radical rulemaking by the Biden administration and Democrats.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the previous question and "yes" on the rule.

The material previously referred to by Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 891 OFFERED BY
MS. LEGER FERNANDEZ OF NEW MEXICO

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the resolution (H. Res. 178) affirming the House of Representatives' commitment to protect and strengthen Social Security and Medicare. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means or their respective designees.

SEC. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H. Res. 178.

Mr. RESCIENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time,

and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. RESCIENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 213, nays 205, answered "present" 1, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 678]

YEAS—213

Aderholt	Fry	Meuser
Alford	Fulcher	Miller (IL)
Allen	Gallagher	Miller (OH)
Amodei	Garbarino	Miller (WV)
Armstrong	Garcia, Mike	Miller-Meeks
Arrington	Gimenez	Mills
Babin	Gonzales, Tony	Molinaro
Bacon	Good (VA)	Moolenaar
Baird	Gooden (TX)	Mooney
Balderson	Gosar	Moore (AL)
Banks	Granger	Moore (UT)
Barr	Graves (LA)	Moran
Bean (FL)	Graves (MO)	Murphy
Bentz	Green (TN)	Nehls
Bergman	Greene (GA)	Newhouse
Bice	Griffith	Norman
Biggs	Grothman	Nunn (IA)
Bilirakis	Guest	Oberholte
Bishop (NC)	Guthrie	Ogles
Boebert	Hageman	Owens
Bost	Harris	Palmer
Brecheen	Harshbarger	Pence
Buchanan	Hern	Perry
Buck	Higgins (LA)	Pflugger
Bucshon	Hill	Posey
Burchett	Hinson	Reschenthaler
Burgess	Houchin	Rodgers (WA)
Burlison	Hudson	Rodgers (AL)
Calvert	Huizenga	Rogers (KY)
Cammack	Hunt	Rose
Carey	Issa	Rosendale
Carl	Jackson (TX)	Rouzer
Carter (GA)	James	Roy
Carter (TX)	Johnson (OH)	Rutherford
Chavez-DeRemer	Johnson (SD)	Salazar
Ciscomani	Jordan	Scallise
Cline	Joyce (OH)	Schweikert
Cloud	Joyce (PA)	Self
Clyde	Kean (NJ)	Sessions
Cole	Kelly (MS)	Simpson
Collins	Kiggans (VA)	Smith (MO)
Comer	Kiley	Smith (NE)
Crane	Kim (CA)	Smith (NJ)
Crawford	Kustoff	Spartz
Crenshaw	LaLota	Staubert
Curtis	LaMalfa	Steel
D'Esposito	Lamborn	Stefanik
Davidson	Langworthy	Steil
De La Cruz	Latta	Steube
Diaz-Balart	LaTurner	Strong
Donalds	Lawler	Tenney
Duarte	Lee (FL)	Thompson (PA)
Duncan	Lesko	Tiffany
Dunn (FL)	Letlow	Timmons
Edwards	Loudermilk	Turner
Ellzey	Lucas	Valadao
Emmer	Luetkemeyer	Van Drew
Estes	Luna	Van Duyen
Ezell	Luttrell	Van Orden
Fallon	Mace	Wagner
Feenstra	Malliotakis	Walberg
Ferguson	Maloy	Waltz
Finstad	Mann	Weber (TX)
Fischbach	Massie	Webster (FL)
Fitzgerald	McCarthy	Wenstrup
Fitzpatrick	McCaul	Westerman
Fleischmann	McClain	Williams (NY)
Flood	McClintock	
Foxx	McCormick	
Franklin, Scott	McHenry	

Williams (TX) Wittman Yakym
Wilson (SC) Womack Zinke

NAYS—205

Adams Golden (ME) Pallone
Aguilar Goldman (NY) Panetta
Allred Gomez Pappas
Amo Gonzalez, Pascarell
Auchincloss Vicente Payne
Balint Gottheimer Peltola
Barragán Green, Al (TX) Perez
Beatty Grijalva Peters
Bera Harder (CA) Pettersen
Beyer Hayes Pingree
Bishop (GA) Higgins (NY) Ruppertsberger
Blumenauer Himes Porter
Blunt Rochester Horsford Pressley
Bonamici Houlihan Quigley
Bowman Hoyer Ramirez
Boyle (PA) Hoyle (OR) Raskin
Brown Huffman Ross
Brownley Ivey Ruiz
Budzinski Jackson (IL) Ruppertsberger
Bush Jackson (NC) Ryan
Caraveo Jacobs Salinas
Carbajal Jayapal Sánchez
Cárdenas Jeffries Scanlon
Carson Johnson (GA) Schakowsky
Carter (LA) Kamlager-Dove Schiff
Cartwright Kaptur Schneider
Casar Keating Scholten
Case Kelly (IL) Schrier
Casten Khanna Scott (VA)
Castor (FL) Kildee Scott, David
Castro (TX) Kilmer Scott, David
Cherfilus-McCormick Kim (NJ) Sewell
Chu Krishnamoorthi Sherman
Clark (MA) Kuster Sherrill
Clarke (NY) Landsman Slotkin
Cleaver Larsen (WA) Smith (WA)
Clyburn Larson (CT) Sorensen
Cohen Lee (CA) Soto
Connolly Lee (PA) Spanberger
Correa Leger Fernandez Stansbury
Costa Levin Stanton
Courtney Lieu Stevens
Craig Lofgren Strickland
Crockett Lynch Swalwell
Crow Magaziner Sykes
Cuellar Manning Takano
Davids (KS) Matsui Thanedar
Davis (IL) McBath Thompson (CA)
Davis (NC) McClellan Thompson (MS)
DeGette Titus
DeLauro McGarvey Tlaib
DelBene McGovern Tokuda
Deluzio Meeks Tonko
DeSaulnier Menendez Torres (CA)
Dingell Meng Torres (NY)
Doggett Mfume Trahan
Escobar Morelle Trone
Eshoo Moskowitz Underwood
Espaillat Moulton Vargas
Evans Mrvan Vasquez
Fletcher Mullin Veasey
Foster Mullin Velázquez
Foushee Napolitano Wasserman
Frankel, Lois Neal Schultz
Frost Neguse Waters
Galleo Nickel Watson Coleman
Garamendi Norcross Wild
Garcia (IL) Ocasio-Cortez Williams (GA)
Garcia, Robert Omar Wilson (FL)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Santos

NOT VOTING—15

Dean (PA) Kelly (PA) Phillips
DesJarlais LaHood Sarbanes
Gaetz Lee (NV) Scott, Austin
Garcia (TX) Mast Smucker
Jackson Lee Pelosi Wexton

□ 1356

Mses. CLARK of Massachusetts and MANNING, and Mr. ESPAILLAT changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. POSEY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 212, noes 205, answered "present" 1, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 679]

AYES—212

Aderholt Garbarino Miller-Meeks
Alford Garcia, Mike Mills
Allen Gimenez Molinaro
Amodei Gonzales, Tony Moolenaar
Armstrong Good (VA) Moonney
Arrington Gooden (TX) Moore (AL)
Babin Gosar Moore (UT)
Bacon Granger Moran
Baird Graves (LA) Murphy
Balderson Nehls Graves (MO)
Banks Green (TN) Newhouse
Barr Greene (GA) Norman
Bean (FL) Griffith Nunn (IA)
Bentz Grothman Obernoite
Bergman Guest Ogles
Bice Guthrie Owens
Bilirakis Hageman Palmer
Bishop (NC) Harris Pence
Boebert Harshbarger Perry
Bost Hern Pfleger
Brecheen Hill Posey
Buchanan Hill Reschenthaler
Buck Hinson Rodgers (WA)
Bucshon Houschong Rogers (AL)
Burchett Hudson Rogers (KY)
Burgess Huizenga Rose
Burison Hunt Rosendale
Calvert Issa Rouzer
Cammack James Roy
Carey Johnson (OH) Rutherford
Carl Johnson (SD) Salazar
Carter (GA) Jordan Scalise
Carter (TX) Joyce (OH) Schweikert
Chavez-DeRemer Joyce (PA) Self
Ciscomani Kean (NJ) Sessions
Cline Kelly (MS) Simpson
Cloud Kiggans (VA) Smith (MO)
Clyde Kiley Smith (NE)
Cole Kim (CA) Smith (NJ)
Collins Kustoff Smucker
Comer LaHood Spartz
Crane LaLota Stauber
Crawford LaMalfa Steel
Crenshaw Lamborn Stefanik
Curtis Langworthy Steil
D'Esposito Latta Steube
Davidson De La Cruz Strong
De La Cruz Lawler
Diaz-Balart Lee (FL) Tenney
Donalds Lesko Thompson (PA)
Duarte Letlow Tiffany
Duncan Loudermilk Timmons
Dunn (FL) Lucas Turner
Edwards Luetkemeyer Valadao
Eilzey Luna Van Drew
Emmer Luttrell Van Duyn
Estes Mace Van Orden
Ezell Malletakis Wagner
Feenstra Maloy Walberg
Ferguson Mann Waltz
Finstad Massie Weber (TX)
Fischbach McCarthy Webster (FL)
Fitzgerald McCaul Wenstrup
Fitzpatrick McClain Westerman
Flood Fleischmann McClintock
Foxy McHenry Williams (TX)
Franklin, Scott Meuser Wilson (SC)
Fry Miller (IL) Wittman
Fulcher Miller (OH) Womack
Gallagher Miller (WV) Yakym
Zinke

NOES—205

Barragán Blunt Rochester
Beatty Bonamici
Bera Bowman
Beyer Boyle (PA)
Bishop (GA) Brown
Blumenauer Brownley

Budzinski Houlihan Peters
Bush Hoyer Pettersen
Caraveo Hoyle (OR) Pingree
Carbajal Huffman Pocan
Cárdenas Ivey Porter
Carson Jackson (IL) Pressley
Carter (LA) Jackson (NC) Quigley
Cartwright Jacobs Ramirez
Casar Jayapal Raskin
Case Jeffries Ross
Casten Johnson (GA) Ruiz
Castor (FL) Kamlager-Dove Ruppertsberger
Castro (TX) Kaptur Ryan
Cherfilus-McCormick Keating Salinas
Chu Kelly (IL) Scanlon
Clark (MA) Khanna Sánchez
Clarke (NY) Kildee Slotkin
Cleaver Kim (NJ) Schakowsky
Clyburn Krishnamoorthi Schiff
Cohen Kuster Schneider
Connolly Schrier Scholten
Correa Landsman Schrier
Costa Larsen (WA) Scott (VA)
Craig Larson (CT) Scott, David
Crockett Lee (CA) Sewell
Crow Lee (PA) Sherman
Cuellar Leger Fernandez Sherrill
Davids (KS) Levin Slotkin
Davis (IL) Lieu Smith (WA)
Davis (NC) Lofgren Sorensen
DeGette Lynch Soto
DeLauro Magaziner Spanberger
Deluzio Manning Stansbury
DeSaulnier Matsui Stanton
Dingell McBath Stevens
Doggett McClellan Strickland
Escobar McCollum Swalwell
Eshoo McGarvey Sykes
Espaillat McGovern Takano
Evans Meeks Thanedar
Fletcher Menendez Thompson (CA)
Foster Meng Thompson (MS)
Foushee Moore (WI) Titus
Frankel, Lois Morelle Tlaib
Frost Moskowitz Tokuda
Galleo Moulton Tonko
Garamendi Mrvan Torres (CA)
Garcia (IL) Mullin Torres (NY)
Garcia, Robert Nadler Trahan
Neal Trone
Golden (ME) Napolitano Underwood
Goldman (NY) Neal Underwood
Gomez Neguse Vargas
Gonzalez, Nickel Vasquez
Vicente Norcross Veasey
Vicente Ocasio-Cortez Velázquez
Gottheimer Omar Wasserman
Green, Al (TX) Pallone Schultz
Grijalva Panetta Waters
Harder (CA) Pappas Watson Coleman
Hayes Pascarell Wexton
Higgins (NY) Payne Wild
Himes Peltola Williams (GA)
Horsford Perez Wilson (FL)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Santos

NOT VOTING—16

Biggs Gaetz Pelosi
Courtney Jackson (TX) Phillips
Dean (PA) Jackson Lee Sarbanes
DelBene Kelly (PA) Scott, Austin
DesJarlais Lee (NV)
Fallon Mast

□ 1403

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "AYE" on rollcall No. 679.

Mr. JACKSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall No. 679.

Stated against:

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I missed rollcall No. 679 on the Rule (H. Res. 891) for three bills under consideration on the floor this week:

H.R. 5283, "Protecting our Communities from Failure to Secure the Border Act; H.R. 5961, "No Funds for Iranian Terrorism Act"; and S.J. Res. 32, "Providing for congressional disapproval, relating to "Small Business Lending Under the Equal Credit Opportunity Act".

Had I recorded my vote, I would have voted "no" on the Rule, H. Res. 891.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 678 and "yea" on rollcall No. 679.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, during Roll Call votes on the motion on ordering the previous question (H. Res. 891) and H. Res. 891, the Rule for H.R. 5283, H.R. 5961, and S.J. Res. 32, my vote was not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 678 and "nay" on rollcall No. 679.

PROTECTING OUR COMMUNITIES FROM FAILURE TO SECURE THE BORDER ACT OF 2023

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5283.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 891 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 5283.

The Chair appoints the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. McCLAIN) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1412

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5283) to prohibit the use of Federal funds to provide housing to specified aliens on any land under the administrative jurisdiction of the Federal land management agencies, with Mrs. McCLAIN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources, or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, today I rise in support of H.R. 5283, legislation sponsored by my colleague from New York City, Congresswoman MALLIOTAKIS.

This legislation would protect our national parks, prevent wasteful spending, and hold the Biden administration accountable for its failed border policies.

The Protecting our Communities from Failure to Secure the Border Act of 2023 would prohibit the use of any Federal funding, leases, or contracts to construct housing facilities for illegal immigrants on our Nation's Federal lands.

It would also put an end to the legally questionable lease that the Biden administration signed with New York City to house thousands of migrants at Floyd Bennett Field, which is owned and managed by the National Park Service.

Madam Chair, our national parks have been described as America's best idea. They are places we go to experience the outdoors and spend time with our friends, family, and community.

That was true of Floyd Bennett Field, which drew an average of 1 million visitors per year for its ice skating rinks, petting zoos, UC cadet programs, bird watching, bike races, and much more.

□ 1415

If you go to Floyd Bennett Field today, you wouldn't see any children on playgrounds or fishermen dotting the shoreline. Instead, you would see massive tents, hastily thrown together over the last few weeks to house 2,000 migrants in semi-congregate facilities.

This tent city has been called a recipe for disaster.

Local Democrat and Republican elected officials, the U.S. Park Police Union, the Legal Aid Society, and the Coalition for the Homeless have all spoken out against using Floyd Bennett Field as a migrant housing facility.

The Park Police Union testified before the Committee on Natural Resources that it was a, "law enforcement nightmare and public safety disaster in the making."

Numerous organizations have raised concerns about inadequate bathroom facilities, cramped sleeping areas, and hazards for children.

The local fire department said the area is a fire trap and lacks basic safety features, like fire hydrants. If that wasn't enough, the entire facility is located in a flood plain that floods even on days with light rain.

Maybe the Biden administration would have known about these issues ahead of time had they not tried to get around the National Environmental Policy Act by improperly declaring this as an emergency.

Perhaps it is no surprise that when the first busloads of migrants started

arriving at Floyd Bennett Field, they turned right back around and refused to stay there.

Migrant families are now warning each other against staying there, saying that the site is freezing cold, babies are suffering, it is not suitable for children, and believe it or not, there are no televisions.

This entire boondoggle has been a colossal waste of time and American tax dollars.

Why are we here? Because of failed Democrat policies.

President Biden has failed to secure our border leading to a record number of migrant apprehensions last month.

Liberal New York Democrats have turned New York into a sanctuary city whose right-to-shelter laws will cost an estimated \$12 billion over the next 3 years just to house undocumented immigrants.

The mission of the National Park Service is to conserve the natural and cultural resources for the enjoyment of future generations, not bail out the failed border policies of the Biden administration.

The use of emergency declarations at Floyd Bennett Field is a result of a man-made problem that President Biden is responsible for.

The border crisis is now everywhere in America, and what is happening at Floyd Bennett Field is something that highlights the failures at the southern border. This is the Biden administration's legacy for the National Park Service.

Congresswoman MALLIOTAKIS' legislation will ensure that Federal lands throughout the country, including parks such as Hot Springs National Park in my district and the Grand Canyon in the ranking member's home State, remain natural wonders, not tent cities for illegal immigrants.

Madam Chair, I thank Representative MALLIOTAKIS for her strong leadership on this effort. I support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,

Washington, DC, November 14, 2023.

Hon. BRUCE WESTERMAN,

Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter confirms our mutual understanding regarding H.R. 5283, the "Protecting our Communities from Failure to Secure the Border Act of 2023". Thank you for collaborating with the Committee on Agriculture on the matters within our jurisdiction.

The Committee on Agriculture will forego any further consideration of this bill. However, by foregoing consideration at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over any subject matter contained in this or similar legislation. The Committee on Agriculture also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees should it become necessary and ask that you support such a request.

We would appreciate a response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 5283, and request a copy of our letters on this matter be published in the